



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,381	07/25/2003	Kenneth Willian	ETS-0205	3909

21269 7590 10/04/2005

PEPPER HAMILTON LLP
ONE MELLON CENTER, 50TH FLOOR
500 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,381

Applicant(s)

WILLIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua Joo

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to:
 - i) In Paragraph 0012 and 0019 of the Applicant's Specification, the Specification describes Figure 1 as a "system in accordance with the present invention." However, in Applicant's Drawing, Figure 1 is labeled as "Prior Art." If Figure 1 is a system according to the Applicant's Invention, please submit a drawing without the prior art label.Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - i) As per claims 3 and 14, the line, "embedding within the associated objects related to the presentation and distribution of the associated content items" is written in an unclear manner. The Examiner assumes the word "content," is missing and interprets the line as "embedding within the associated content, objects related to the presentation...".

Art Unit: 2154

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov et al, US Publication #2002/0156812 (Krasnoiarov hereinafter), in view of Gardaz et al, US Publication #2004/0109197 (Gardaz hereinafter).

7. As per claims 1 and 12, Krasnoiarov teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for converting a plurality of files to different formats. Krasnoiarov's teachings comprise of:

providing a user interface that enables a user to enter a request for converting a plurality of deliverables to the formats suitable for presentation, each deliverable including an associated content item and a corresponding associated format to which to convert the associated content item (Paragraph 0046. User requests personalized set of content components. Paragraph 0105. User indicates display preferences for each component.);

preparing the associated content items for conversion based on the corresponding associated formats (Paragraph 0057. Generates components.);

converting the associated content items using a plurality of parallel processing threads (Paragraph 0057; 0063. Parallel processing. Convert components; non-HTML

Art Unit: 2154

to HTML, XML to HTML.), each thread corresponding to an associated deliverable (Paragraph 0060-0061. Each thread is assigned to a content.);

compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over at least one delivery channel (Paragraph 0098. Content is assembled.); and

posting the content to the delivery channel (Paragraph 0098. Assembled content is send to the user.).

8. Krasnoiarov teaches of parallel processing wherein a plurality of threads work in parallel to process user's request. However, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach of each thread converting the associated content item to the corresponding associated format.

9. Gardaz teaches of a server that processes threads in parallel (Paragraph 0163; 0182), wherein the server converts files from one format to another (Paragraph 0062; 0095; 0108).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov and Gardaz because both teachings are similar in that they deal with parallel processing and the converting of files to different formats. Furthermore, the teachings of Gardaz for processing threads in parallel for the conversion of files would improve the teachings of Gardaz by decreasing the time required to process client's request thereby improving the efficiency of Gardaz's teachings.

11. As per claims 2 and 13, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein preparing the associated content items for conversion comprises retrieving the associated content items from a database (Paragraph 0060. Component servers.).

Art Unit: 2154

12. As per claims 3 and 14, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein preparing the associated content items for conversion comprises customizing the associated content items (Paragraph 0105. User request includes specifying how to generate a component. User preference.).

13. As per claims 4 and 15, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein customizing the associated content items comprises embedding within the associated objects related to the presentation (Paragraph 0105. Presentation and desired content components.) and distribution of the associated content items (Paragraph 0098. Content is assembled and send to the requesting client.).

14. As per claims 6 and 16, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, further comprising receiving a request to convert the plurality of deliverables to the plurality of formats suitable for presentation (Paragraph 0046. User requests personalized content components.), the request including a selected delivery channel over which to distribute the converted deliverables (Paragraph 0097. Content is assembled and returned to the user. Paragraph 0057. HTTP. Selected delivery channel is inherent.).

15. As per claims 8 and 17, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, further comprising distributing the converted deliverables over the selected delivery channel (Paragraph 0097. Content is assembled and returned to the user. Paragraph 0057. HTTP. Selected delivery channel is inherent.).

Art Unit: 2154

16. As per claims 9 and 18, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, further comprising presenting the converted deliverables at a presentation client (Paragraph 0105. Request for presentation of content.).

17. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov and Gardaz, in view of Alonso et al, US Patent #6,184,878 (Alonso hereinafter).

18. As per claim 5, Krasnoiarov teaches the method of converting content to a page description language and converting the page description language to the format suitable for presentation (Paragraph 0057; 0105. Convert non-HTML into HTML. XML into HTML). However, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach the process comprising of parsing the associated content items to identify content to be presented and converting the parsed content to a page description language.

19. Alonso teaches of parsing a web page to identify HTML content and converting the HTML page into a video page (Col 4, line 66-Col 5, line 15).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov, Gardaz, and Alonso because all three teachings are similar in that they deal with the converting of content from one format to another. Furthermore, the teachings of Alonso to parse and identify content to convert formats would improve the system of Krasnoiarov and Gardaz by specifically explaining the process of converting content from one format to another, wherein the process would involve determining the specific components in a content and converting the components according to the user's request.

Art Unit: 2154

21. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov and Gardaz, in view of Huetsch et al, US Publication #2002/0049842 (Huetsch hereinafter).
22. As per claim 7, Krasnoiarov does not teach the method of claim 6, further comprising logging the request in a request history.
23. Huetsch teaches of maintaining a client request history (Paragraph 0037).
24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov, Gardaz, and Huetsch because the teachings of Huetsch to maintain a client request history would improve the system of Krasnoiarov and Huetsch by allowing the server to cache content based on the latest user requests, thus requiring less time to service clients.
25. Claims 10, 11, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov and Gardaz, in view of Gillford et al, US Publication #2003/0123622 (Gifford hereinafter).
26. As per claims 10, 11, 19, and 20, Krasnoiarov teaches of presenting content to the client according to the client's preference (Paragraph 0105). However, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach of presenting a printed or an audible version of the deliverables at the presentation client.
27. Gifford teaches of receiving content, where the content may be converted to a printed version such as FAX messages in PDF or audio messages in WAV or in RealAudio (Paragraph 0156).

Art Unit: 2154

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov, Gardaz, and Gillford because all three teachings are similar in that they deal with converting content to present to the user. Krasnoiarov and Gillford are further related in that Krasnoiarov teaches of requesting personalized content, wherein the content may be an email (Paragraph 0046), and Gifford's teaches of converting email content to different formats. The teachings of Gifford to convert data into printed or audible version would improve the system of Krasnoiarov and Gardaz by allowing the client to receive content in a plurality of different presentable formats.

Conclusion

29. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- i) Rhie et al, US Patent #6,366,650, teaches that a web page may be converted and be delivered via voice format or fax machine.
- ii) Tso et al, US Patent #6,247,050, teaches of converting different type of data content such as image, video, or HTML according to user preference.

30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

Art Unit: 2154

32. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

33. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 22, 2005

JJ

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100